

# The CAPITOL EYE

Watches Your Interest in Congress



VOL. I

JANUARY, 1922

No. 4

## FEATURES

THIS MONTH

Classified List of All Bills on Health and Education  
Pending in Congress

---

The Siegel "Re-apportionment Bill"

Discussed

*Pro and Con*

by

Twelve Members of the House

---

New "Public Welfare" Laws

1. The "Beer Bill"—Its Administration  
by The Federal Prohibition Commissioner
2. The "Maternity Bill"—Its Administration  
by The Chief, Federal Children's Bureau

---

A Key to Congress

## The CAPITOL EYE gives you:

- A short-cut to Congress.
- A close-up of federal bills affecting public health, education and economy.
- A personal statement from Senators and Representatives.
- A line-up of the lobby.
- All sides presented equally.
- An explanation of legislative terms and proceedings.
- A chance to "come back" with an individual opinion.

"Capitol-Eye-ze Your Knowledge"

Five Dollars Yearly

## The CAPITOL EYE DIRECT SERVICE

**F**OR the benefit of those seeking detailed and immediate information on federal welfare bills  
The Capitol Eye Publishing Company maintains a direct service. Rates forwarded upon request.

### Facts

on

- How these bills will affect the health and education of your community.
- How your Congressman is voting on them.
- How and when to offer relevant amendments.
- Advance dates on hearings.
- The roll-call in the Senate and House when a vote is taken.
- Complete list of such bills in the current session.
- Complete list of organizations testifying at the hearings.

---

## The CAPITOL EYE

NOT AN OFFICIAL ORGAN

NOT CONTROLLED BY NOR UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ANY PARTICULAR INTEREST, CLASS OR SECT

PUBLISHED BY THE CAPITOL EYE PUBLISHING COMPANY, - - - - - MUNSEY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE EDITORS

ALICE GRAM

V. HITCHCOCK

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: FIFTY CENTS A COPY, FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR, POSTPAID IN THE UNITED STATES

Copyright, 1921, by The Capitol Eye Publishing Company, Washington, D. C.

Entered as Second-Class Matter September 26th, 1921, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

---

## CONTENTS

Features	Front Page
Announcements	2
History and Contents of Siegel "Re-apportionment Bill"	3
The House Discusses the Siegel "Re-apportionment Bill"	4
Members of the House Discuss "Re-apportionment"	5-6
Wall Street Discusses "Re-apportionment"	7
Classified List of All Health Bills Pending in Congress	8-12
Classified List of All Education Bills Pending in Congress	13-15
New "Public Welfare" Laws Explained	16
A Key to Congress	17
Query Column	18
News Section	18
The "Come-Back"	19
Trade-Mark	20

# PUBLIC ECONOMY SECTION

## THE SIEGEL "RE-APPORTIONMENT BILL"

### HISTORY OF BILL

Every ten years Congress must take note of the total population as revealed by the latest United States Census and decide the ratio of apportionment for representation in Congress.

Two rules were laid down by the Constitution as to this ratio—first, that there should not be more than one Representative for every thirty thousand inhabitants; second, that every State, no matter what its total population, should have at least one Representative.

There were 65 members of the House of Representatives in the first Congress, based on an approximate ratio of one to every 61,000 inhabitants. A Federal census was subsequently taken and the apportionment ratio set at 33,000, giving the second Congress a House membership of 105.

If this ratio had been fixed by law, the present representation in the House would exceed 3,000 members. It has therefore become necessary with the rapid growth of the country to increase the ratio every ten years to keep the size of the House within reasonable limits.

In keeping with the 13 censuses from 1790 to 1910, the membership in the House was increased from 65 to 433 and the ratio from 30,000 to 211,877.

With the 1920 or 14th Census, now before them, Congress must again determine the ratio for membership in the House of Representatives.

Last year, during the 66th Congress, various re-apportionment bills were introduced. These were all referred to the House Committee on the Census, which at length reported out a bill to increase the membership from 435 to 483. This increase was defeated, but an amendment to retain the membership at 435 was accepted and the bill passed the House. It went to the Senate, but failed to come to a vote before the session closed, and the bill died with the 66th Congress.

Immediately upon the convening of the 67th Congress a new group of re-apportionment bills was introduced in the House. Representative Barbour of California, Representative Fairfield of Indiana, and Representative McArthur of Oregon introduced bills to retain the membership at 435. Another bill by Representative Blanton of Texas would reduce the membership to 340. Another by Representative Sweet of Iowa would increase the membership to 460. All of these bills were referred to the Committee on the Census, of which Representative Siegel of New York is chairman. Early in the session Mr. Siegel had introduced a Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which would fix the membership of the House at not more than 500, providing, in addition for new States.

On June 27, 28 and 29 hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Census Committee at which only members of the House testified. A few weeks later an agreement was reached by the Committee to report out a bill increasing the membership to 460. On July 21, 1921, Representative Siegel introduced his "460" bill, H. R. 7882, which the Committee agreed to report out favorably, reserving the right to amend it on the floor. On October 14, after a heated debate on the floor of the House, the bill was re-committed without instructions to the Census Committee, where it now lies.

At the beginning of the second session of the 67th Congress, Representative Larsen of Georgia, a member of the Census Committee, offered a Joint Resolution "proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, excluding aliens in the apportionment of representatives among the several States." The following week Congress adjourned for the Christmas recess without further action on the Re-apportionment issue.

### THE BILL H. R. 7882

After the 3d day of March, 1923, the House of Representatives shall be composed of four hundred and sixty Members, to be apportioned among the several States as follows: Alabama, ten; Arizona, one; Arkansas, eight; California, fifteen; Colorado, four; Connecticut, six; Delaware, one; Florida, four; Georgia, thirteen; Idaho, two; Illinois, twenty-eight; Indiana, thirteen; Iowa, eleven; Kansas, eight; Kentucky, eleven; Louisiana, eight; Maine, three; Maryland, six; Massachusetts, seventeen; Michigan, sixteen; Minnesota, ten; Mississippi, eight; Missouri, fifteen; Montana, two; Nebraska, six; Nevada, one; New Hampshire, two; New Jersey, fourteen; New Mexico, two; New York, forty-five; North Carolina, eleven; North Dakota, three; Ohio, twenty-five; Oklahoma, nine; Oregon, three; Pennsylvania, thirty-eight; Rhode Island, three; South Carolina, seven; South Dakota, three; Tennessee, ten; Texas, twenty; Utah, two; Vermont, two; Virginia, ten; Washington, six; West Virginia, six; Wisconsin, eleven; Wyoming, one.

In each State entitled under this apportionment to more than one Representative, the Representatives to the Sixty-eighth and each subsequent Congress shall be elected by districts composed of a contiguous and compact territory and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. The said districts shall be equal to the number of Representatives to which such State may be entitled in Congress, no district electing more than one Representative.

In case of an increase in the number of Representatives in any State under this apportionment such additional Representative or Representatives shall be elected by the State at large and the other Representatives by the district now prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted in the manner prescribed by the law thereof and in accordance with the rules enumerated in this Act; and if there be no change in the number of Representatives from a State, the Representatives thereof shall be elected from the districts now prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted as hereinafter prescribed; and if there be a decrease in the number of Representatives from a State and the legislature thereof in session after the passage of this Act and before the ensuing election at which Members of Congress are elected fails to redistrict such State, or if the legislature of such State be not in session before the next biennial election, then and in either event the governor, secretary of state, and attorney general of such State are hereby empowered to redistrict such State according to the terms and provisions herein.

Candidates for Representative or Representatives to be elected at large in any State shall be nominated in the same manner as candidates for governor, unless otherwise provided by the laws of such State.

## The "House Discusses the Siegel "Re-apportionment Bill"

*Pro*

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL, NEW YORK

Under the provisions of my bill, the House of Representatives would, after the third day of March, 1923, be composed of 460 Members.

The ratio of population for each Representative would be 228,882 and the only States which would lose Representatives would be Maine and Missouri, which would lose one each.

Under the Constitution, each State is entitled to at least one Representative. Therefore, Delaware, Nevada and Wyoming having less than 228,882 population will still have one Representative.

The present ratio of population for each Representative is 211,877.

The demand for the increase in the size of the House comes directly from the people who feel that with questions involving billions of dollars to be determined annually, Members of the House must become experts in their particular lines of Committee work.

Furthermore, each Congressional District gave approximately 10,000 men in the late war. These ex-service men are entitled to every consideration at the hands of Congress. Experience shows that it requires, I regret to say, the individual attention of Members of Congress to obtain a fair deal in each individual case.

Those who are opposed to the increased Membership of the House have contended that additional clerks could look after the increase work, which is admitted by everybody is bound to come in the next 10 years. I feel, however, that these men are entitled to receive the attention of the individual Representative and not of an additional clerk.

The cost of the additional 25 Members to the House would be practically nil considering the importance of the questions involved. If the views of the opposition to the bill were to be adopted and one additional clerk added to each Member of the House the cost would be at least \$500,000.

Thinking men are, therefore, in favor of an increased representation of the House so that the people themselves may have the opportunity of being closer to their Representatives, as they should be.

Congress is now in session most of the year and the number of questions requiring extensive study is constantly on the increase. The country asks for service and does not raise the question as to what that service will cost provided it is efficient and thorough.

*Con*

HON. LOUIS W. FAIRFIELD, INDIANA

The present House of Representatives has 435 members. In the 66th Congress the Committee on the Census reported out a bill for 482. The minority members submitted a report and brought in an amendment to make it 435. The House approved 435 by a vote of 267 to 76. That vote represented the unbiased judgment of the members of the House in the last Congress. The bill failed to pass the Senate. A new bill was reported out by the Committee for 460. This bill was recommitted by a vote of the House with a number of the members who were favorable to 435 absent, so that legislatively the situation is the same as if nothing had been done.

Re-apportionment should be made by this Congress and before the next election. There is no need for additional Congressmen. The leading men, both Democrats and Republicans, are opposed to any increase in membership. The judgment now, of a majority of the members of the House is that there should be no increase in its size. The only reason that has been advanced is in the interest of particular States that would lose. The real reason is that if the House membership is not increased some member from States that will lose a Representative can not be re-elected to Congress.

The present membership can do everything that 460 members could do. The appropriation now for clerical hire to assist the members in doing the work entailed by the war is one million dollars in excess of what it was before the war period. If the House is raised to 460 members, the twenty-five extra Congressmen will cost half a million dollars additional per year. Soon it would entail extra expense for building. If there were any need of this increase the expense should be cheerfully borne. The increase will make Congress less efficient instead of more efficient. Whatever extra money is appropriated for additional members will be utterly wasted. The House is already too large. That is the belief of all men who have been here any considerable time.

The people do not want an increase. The newspapers and magazines believe it is utterly useless. The men who know most about it in Congress are absolutely opposed to any further increase. The only reason that the matter has been held up or is now jeopardized is for political expediency and to take care of personal fortunes. Eliminate those two elements and the whole House would be practically unanimous against any increase.

\*The Senate does not consider a Re-apportionment Bill until it is passed by the House.



## "Members of the House Discuss "Re-apportionment"

*Should the House Membership be Increased?*

*Pro*

HON. CHARLES L. FAUST, MISSOURI

Legislative action on apportionment of Representatives has always followed the taking of the census and prior to the succeeding Congressional elections. The warrant for such action seems to be plainly drawn from the Constitution.

Thus far the contention on the appropriate size of the House has prevented passage of reported bills. At either the present size of 435, or the number carried in the last reported bill, 460, Missouri, the State I represent in part, would be entitled to less Congressional representation. Under the former the delegation would shrink from sixteen, the present number, to fourteen, and under the latter, to fifteen.

Provision has always been made for election of Representatives in apportionment bills, both for States gaining in number or those maintaining their present number, but heretofore, no method has been enacted for the State losing in Representation.

Missouri insists that some way be provided for the immediate and binding creation of districts, equal to the number of Congressmen permitted in the Apportionment Act, to insure against the certain confusion resulting with sixteen established districts and a less number of Representatives to be elected.

HON. ROSS A. COLLINS, MISSISSIPPI

I think it manifestly unfair to reapportion the Lower House of Congress according to the last census because during the war many people from the rural sections left them and went to the cities. In my State, at least 200,000 people left and migrated to the cities of the North and East where wages were better than on the farms, and most of these people had not returned when the last census was taken. Most of them are back now but this is due to the recent depression in business and the shutting down of mills in the North and East. Leaving the membership of the House of Representatives at 435 and reapportioning it on this basis would unfairly lessen the membership from the rural sections and this would be a great injustice to these sections. The increase to 460 would not be a material one and very little expense to the cost of Government would be added.

The answer to the stock arguments that a large membership is unwieldy is found in the fact that during the last session business was transacted in the House with more rapidity and ease than in the Senate where the membership is materially less than in the House.

*Con*

HON. W. W. LARSEN, GEORGIA

The House is already too large for most efficient legislation. Increased membership can but make it more unwieldy and less efficient for legislation. No public service can be rendered by a membership of 460 that cannot be as well, or better, performed by 435. Increased membership means inexcusable public extravagance for the selfish interest of a few.

Our Constitution should be so amended as to make "citizenship," instead of "population," the basis of representation, for which purpose I have introduced a bill. It would distribute and enable reduction of representation so that a House of 400 members would afford approximately the same per capita representation as at present.

Congressional representation should be for benefit of American citizens and not for aliens to exploit our industries. There are at this time 8,633,431 aliens in America. They increased 1,205,827 from January, 1920, to June, 1921. More than 11 per cent of our adult population are aliens. We exclude Indians who are not taxed from consideration in making apportionment, why should we not exclude aliens also?

HON. JOHN J. McSWAIN, SO. CAROLINA

A serious objection urged by me personally to the Siegel Bill, is to that part seeking to give the Governor, Secretary of State and Attorney General of any State whose representation may be reduced, and whose legislature fails to re-district the State before the next regular Congressional election, the power to divide the State into the required number of Congressional districts. I contend from the Constitution that the power to sub-divide the States into Congressional Districts rests primarily with the State legislatures. The Congressional power to prescribe the times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators, and Representatives, does not include the power to prescribe the territorial areas to be represented.

This is strictly a constitutional question to be decided by reading and studying the Constitution itself and not by reference to our desires and whims, and personal notions of expediency, policy or principle.

Since the testimony of ninety per cent of all who have served in the House of Representatives, says that it is already too large, it would be unpatriotic and unwise to increase it. Since part of the Siegel bill is unconstitutional, it is our sworn duty to reject it.

\*House Members only testified at the hearings on Re-apportionment held during this Congress, which precludes discussion by "The Lobby."

*Pro*

## HON. HAYS B. WHITE, KANSAS

Any proposition to restrict the representation of the people is a perversion of the fundamental idea of representative government and cannot but be a menace to its perpetuity.

To assert that the House on account of its numbers does not and cannot function or that if its numbers shall be increased it will cease to function or will function less efficiently is absurd and erroneous. As well might one contend that the Republic does not function because the citizenry is too numerous. The assertion that the House does not function on account of the great number of its members is not borne out by historical analogy nor by existing comparison. It functions with as much if not more celerity and I believe with as sound wisdom as does the Senate composed as it is of less than one-fourth as many members.

Devoted as I am to the idea of popular government I would rather vote to increase the number of Representatives by one hundred than see them diminished by a single member.

## HON. JAMES W. DUNBAR, INDIANA

The amount of work required of a Congressman by his constituents from most districts, is so great that he cannot give the time and attention to their requests, which they have a right to expect. To increase the number of people a Congressman represents, is to decrease his ability to be of service to them.

In the House, legislation is begun, and completed in much less time than required in the Senate, where there is only twenty per cent of the number of legislators; so it would seem that a large number of members of the House make it possible for the people, by reason of the number, to be closer to the Government and at the same time secure results in legislation.

## HON. MARION E. RHODES, MISSOURI

Section 2, Article 1, of the Constitution, provides that representatives in Congress and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, according to their respective numbers.

Section 2, Article 1 also provides that the actual enumeration of inhabitants of the several States shall be made within three years after the first meeting of Congress, and within every subsequent period of ten years in such manner as Congress shall direct.

This is all the Constitutional authority there is on the subject of taking the census and fixing the basis of representation in Congress, except what appears in Section 2 of the 14th Amendment, and from 1790 down to the present time, Congress has provided for taking the census once in ten years and fixing the basis of representation.

Reapportionment legislation is now due, and the Siegel bill should pass without delay.

*Con*

## HON. THEODORE E. BURTON, OHIO

I am unalterably opposed to any increase in the membership in the House of Representatives. I was a Member of that body when there were only 325 members and can readily trace much of the loss of prestige of the House and the influence of the individual member to the change in membership from 325 to 435. This increase diminishes the desire for membership, minimizes the influence of the individual member, increases expenses and makes it more necessary to adopt drastic rules of procedure which prevent mature and careful consideration of measures pending.

In every case of increase with each successive census and apportionment act the statement has been made that thereafter no increase should be made. In other words, the members have proclaimed that they have not courage enough to act judiciously, but they expected their successors to stand in the way of the unfortunate tendency to increase the size of the House.

## HON. MORGAN G. SANDERS, TEXAS

This is not a party question, and both of the great political parties had pledges of economy in their last platforms. We cannot economize if we go on creating more offices. We have too many offices already, and we already have too many Congressmen. The only way the expenses of this Government can be paid is out of the pockets of the people. The people are hard pressed financially and overburdened with taxation. Why provide more jobs and heap more taxes upon them? There is no public demand for an increase in the membership of the House. There is one thing the people of this Nation, regardless of politics, are agreed upon, and that is that they want the tax burden reduced as much as it can possibly be done consistent with efficient administration.

## HON. HENRY E. BARBOUR, CALIFORNIA

The founders of our Government intended that the House of Representatives should be a truly representative body, where each member should have a reasonable opportunity to present the views and needs of his constituents. To continue increasing the size of the House inevitably means that control will pass to a few members of long service and the real work of legislation will be done almost entirely by the committees. Unless a stop is made, the House will degenerate from a representative body to a mob, in which the views and needs of the average constituency will receive scant consideration. If the membership of the House is retained at 435, each member will represent only 13,533 more persons than he would if it is increased to 460. The small amount of additional work required to represent these 13,533 persons does not justify an increased annual expense of approximately \$500,000.00.

## Wall Street Discusses "Re-apportionment"

*Should the House Membership Be Increased?*

*Pro*

### EXTRACT FROM BRADSTREET'S

With the growth of the United States both in territorial extent and in population since the adoption of the Constitution, the number of representatives in Congress has naturally grown very markedly, notwithstanding the almost constant increase in the ratio of population to representatives. The Constitution in Section 2 of Article 1 provided that the number of representatives should not exceed one for every thirty thousand, but that each state should have at least one representative. Pending an enumeration of the people, it fixed the number of representatives for each of the then existing states. Under this constitutional apportionment the House of Representatives consisted of 65 members. The number of persons entitled to a representative was thereafter increased after each census, but the membership of the House was constantly enlarged except in the apportionments following the censuses of 1840 and 1850. Since then, though with a constant increase in the population ratio, the membership of the House has steadily grown. Finally, under the apportionment following the census of 1910, when the population ratio was raised to 211,877, the membership of the House rose to 435. It will be seen, therefore, that while the number of people represented by one member is now over seven times as great as in the first Congress, the membership of the House itself is over  $6\frac{1}{2}$  times as large.

There are indications that the apportionment to be based upon the census of 1920 will present problems of some interest. According to Washington advices, there is considerable opposition among the members of the House to an increase above its present size, while there are some who favor a reduction in membership. According to the chairman of the committee which will frame the next apportionment bill, unless the membership of the House is increased to at least 500, ten States will lose one or more representatives.

As will be seen by reference to the preceding paragraphs the precedents have been, speaking generally, in the direction of increased membership. It is noted, however, that the House is now crowded when all the members are in their seats, and that it would be something of a problem to bestow comfortably the additional number of members necessary if no state is to have its numerical representation lowered. At the same time it may be said in passing that several of the states have fewer representatives in Congress than they had a century ago. It is perhaps worth noting in connection with the general subject that the popular branches of the British and French legislatures have more members than the House of Representatives would have even with the addition of the new seats above referred to. Thus the British House of Commons has over 700 members and the French Chamber of Deputies has about 600, both considerably in excess of the 500 suggested as necessary to prevent the loss of seats by any state.—*July 31, 1920.*

*Con*

### EXTRACT FROM THE CHRONICLE

The present House of 435 ought not only to be never increased, but really ought to be decreased. It is not true that in a number of counselors there is wisdom. No competent business concern, contemplating a constructive work of large importance, would assemble several hundred engineers, statisticians and financiers, to pass upon expediency and arrange details. A legislative body of any such size is unwieldy, clamorous, selfish, exposed to rushes, and little better than a mob. A House of 300, or even of 250, would be more orderly, more attentive to really national considerations, more thoughtful, more careful, and in all respects more responsible. The members are agents chosen by the people, as necessarily under a democratic form; but since there is no distinct difference between the people of two adjacent Congressional districts, which are separated only by an imaginary State boundary line, one man could as well "represent" the people of both districts as two can do it.

There is, however, one difference which concerns the lowest conceivable idea of "representing" the sections we call districts. This difference is suggested by mentioning a word of ill-repute, "pork," and saying no more. So far as the province of a Congressman is to keep up to the mark in grabbing from the general tax receipts for redistribution "at home," the larger the total membership the easier log-rolling and swinish public expenditures may become.

The larger the House, the greater the number of committees, lest any member have to accept the stigma of being entirely left out. Consequently, the greater the expenditures on committee-space, clerk hire, pointless chatter on the floor, and in that huge waste of governmental printing, within and without the "Record," necessarily, too, in salaries, mileage and incidentals. The difficulty of reducing the number of civil employees on the payroll, and the tendency to progressively increase that number, would also be less with a small House membership than with a larger one. Out of the defects in human nature comes the truth, needing little qualification, that the quality and service of government are almost in inverse ratio to its cost.

The undeniable deterioration in statesmanship in the Senate and the consequent failure to serve as the intended balance-wheel on the impulses of the House is another reason why the need of this check should not be made greater by increasing the size of the lower branch but should even be made less by making that branch smaller.

Just now we are much absorbed in complaints of our troubles and in crying to Government to pull us out. But if we would sit down and calmly think (as we may begin to, ere long) we shall realize that Government is what most needs reforming, and that if we really demand and expect better progress and lighter taxes we must improve at the centre and not look to the centre to improve the country.—*Oct. 15, 1921.*



## CLASSIFIED LIST OF ALL HEALTH BILLS PENDING IN CONGRESS

## HEALTH, GENERAL PUBLIC

A Bill, S. 416.—*To provide for the promotion of physical education in the United States through cooperation with the States in the preparation and payment of supervisors and teachers of physical education, including health supervisors and school nurses, to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure, etc.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Senator Capper of Kansas. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor. Identical to H. R. 22.

\*Featured in the December number of The Capitol Eye.

A Bill, H. R. 2193.—*To amend "An Act to amend 'An Act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes.'"*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Miller of Washington. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means. Identical to S. 206.

A Bill, H. R. 116.—*To authorize the issuing to doctors of medicine licensed to practice in any one State, United States license permitting practice in any State of the United States, etc.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Mason of Illinois. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, H. R. 2372.—*To amend the National Prohibition Act to prevent the sale, for medicinal purposes, of all distilled spirits testing less than ninety proof.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Vare of Pennsylvania. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

A Bill, S. 408.—*To establish a Department of Social Welfare.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Kenyon of Iowa. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor.

A Bill, S. 398.—*To provide Federal aid in caring for indigent tuberculous persons and for other purposes.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Ashurst of Arizona. Referred to Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A Bill, S. 526.—*To establish a Department of Health and for other purposes.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Owen of Oklahoma. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, S. 802.—*To incorporate the American Society of Cancer; to collect, collate and disseminate knowledge concerning the symptoms, diagnosis, treatment and prevention of cancer; to investigate the conditions under which cancer is found and to compile statistics in regard thereto.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Wadsworth of New York. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

A Bill, H. R. 2890.—*To prohibit the sale of peyote to Indians, etc.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Representative Hayden of Arizona. Referred to Committee on Indian Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 3737.—*Making an appropriation of \$400,000 to meet State cooperation in the extermination of predatory animals and destructive rodents.*

Introduced on April 15, 1921, by Representative Hayden of Arizona. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, H. R. 4103.—*Making an appropriation to enforce the provisions of an Act to regulate the sale of viruses, serums, toxins and analogous products, and to regulate interstate traffic in said articles, etc.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, H. R. 4109.—*Making an appropriation for the destruction of animals affected with rabies or other animal diseases dangerous to the health of human beings as well as domestic animals, etc.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, H. R. 4104.—*Making an appropriation directing and empowering the purchase, preparation and disposition free of cost of antirabic virus to be used in the treatment of persons exposed to rabies, etc.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, H. R. 5022.—*To create a cause of action for compensation in damages for injuries sustained and death resulting from injuries to any person through the wrongful act or omission by an agent, officer or employee of the United States Government, and to provide the procedure therefor.*

Introduced on April 25, 1921, by Representative Hickey of Indiana. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

A Bill, H. R. 5617.—*To establish a bureau for the study of criminal, pauper and defective classes.*

Introduced on May 2, 1921, by Representative Walsh of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

A Bill, H. R. 5680.—*To extend the franking privileges to literature published by Boards of Health of States and Territories in the United States.*

Introduced on May 3, 1921, by Representative Clark of Florida. Referred to Committee on Postoffices and Post Roads.

A Bill, S. 1607.—*To establish a Department of Public Welfare, etc.*

Introduced on May 4, 1921, by Senator Kenyon of Iowa. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor. Identical to H. R. 5837.

\*Featured in the November number of The Capitol Eye.

A Bill, S. 1839.—*To create a Department of Public Welfare, etc.*

Introduced in May 17, 1921, by Senator McCormick of Illinois. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor.

A Bill, S. 258.—*Concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Walsh of Montana. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary. Reported by Committee without amendment May 17, 1921.



A Bill, H. R. 6566.—*Allowing deductions in computing the tax on personal incomes of less than \$5,000 for expenses for medicines, for bills paid physicians, surgeons and hospitals and for funeral expenses.*

Introduced on May 24, 1921, by Representative Rosenbloom of West Virginia. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A Bill, H. R. 7639.—*Making illegal the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States by oil and other refuse matter and providing a penalty therefor.*

Introduced on June 24, 1921, by Representative Appleby of New Jersey. Referred to Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

A Bill, H. R. 9234.—*To regulate interstate traffic in sutures and surgical ligature material, etc.*

Introduced on November 21, 1921, by Representative Johnson of Washington. Referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## HEALTH, MILITARY AND NAVAL

A Bill, H. R. 114.—*To amend and reenact sections of the Revised Statutes, which provide for retiring of incapacitated officers for further service, etc.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Mason of Illinois. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 2285.—*Authorizing the Secretary of War to provide for medical treatment and hospital care of officers, enlisted men and civilian employees of the Military Establishment while on furlough, necessitated by disability originating in the line of duty.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Rogers of Massachusetts. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 2440.—*To provide for the segregation and care of men in the United States Army afflicted with mental and nervous maladies.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Representative King of Illinois. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 9000.—*To provide for the appointment of three veterans of the World War to the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteers.*

Introduced on November 3, 1921, by Representative Kleczka of Wisconsin. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 7738.—*To pay or reimburse for expenditures incurred by officers, enlisted men and members of the Nurse Corps of the Army, for civilian medical services and hospital care while away from their commands.*

Introduced on July 12, 1921, by Representative Volstead of Minnesota. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, S. 30.—*To retain in military service partially disabled men and officers able to perform certain classes of work.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Poindexter of Washington. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, S. 2668.—*To authorize an appropriation to enable the Director of the United States Veterans Bureau to provide for the construction of additional hospital facilities and to provide medical, surgical and hospital services and supplies for persons who served in the World War and are patients in the United States Veterans Bureau.*

Introduced on October 20, 1921, by Senator Ashurst of Arizona. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Identical to H. R. 8791.

A Bill, S. 2667.—*To provide additional hospital facilities for persons who served in the World War and making appropriations therefor.*

Introduced on October 20, 1921, by Senator Ashurst of Arizona. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, S. 2458.—*To authorize the acquirement of hospital and other facilities for the treatment of World War Veterans afflicted with mental and nervous diseases.*

Introduced on September 21, 1921, by Senator Stanley of Kentucky. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

A Bill, S. 2547.—*To amend the Act to establish a Veterans Bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the War Risk Insurance Act.*

Introduced on October 4, 1921, by Senator Robinson of Arkansas. Referred to the Committee on Finance. Identical to H. R. 8959.

A Bill, S. 1565.—*Making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the Regular Army all officers of the United States Army during the World War who have incurred physical disability in the line of duty.*

Introduced on May 4, 1921, by Senator Bursum of New Mexico. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 216.—*To incorporate The Disabled American Veterans of the World War.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Longworth of Ohio. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Identical to S. 406.

A Bill, H. R. 2501.—*To increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the Naval Reserve Forces.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Representative Butler of Pennsylvania. Referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 7159.—*To authorize physicians and surgeons honorably discharged from the United States Army to practice their profession in any Territory, District, Dependency, or possessions of the United States under the Constitutional Jurisdiction of Congress upon proper qualification.*

Introduced on June 15, 1921, by Representative Patterson of Missouri. Referred to Committee on the Territories.

A Bill, H. R. 9490.—*To provide for medical and hospital services for the officers and seamen of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.*

Introduced on December 12, 1921, by Representative Winslow of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## HEALTH, U. S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A Bill, S. 525.—*To establish a sanitary reserve corps for the Public Health Service.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Owen of Oklahoma. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, S. 1787.—*To amend "An Act to increase the efficiency of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service."*

Introduced on May 12, 1921, by Senator Gerry of Rhode Island. Referred to Committee on Naval Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 7541.—*Providing for a commissioned status to sanitary engineers in the Public Health Service of the United States.*

Introduced on July 1, 1921, by Representative Sweet of Iowa. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, H. R. 7687.—*Authorizing boards of investigation of the United States Public Health Service to subpoena witnesses.*

Introduced on July 9, 1921, by Representative Winslow of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary

A Bill, S. 2764.—*To reorganize and to promote the efficiency of the United States Public Health Service.*

Introduced on November 16, 1921, by Senator Watson of Indiana. Referred to Committee on Finance. Identical to H. R. 9291.

## HEALTH, PURE FOOD

A Bill, H. R. 147.—*To prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation in interstate commerce of misbranded articles, to regulate the traffic therein, etc.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Barkley of Kentucky. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, H. R. 65.—*To amend "An Act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, etc."*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Barkley of Kentucky. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, H. R. 65.—*To amend "An Act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, etc."*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative French of Idaho. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, S. 812.—*To prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, etc.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Frelinghuysen of New Jersey. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A Bill, H. R. 4136.—*To provide for marking the carcasses of goats with the words "Goat meat."*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Hayden of Arizona. Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

A Bill, S. 1887.—*To protect interstate commerce in foods, drugs, and medicines, and to extend the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906.*

Introduced on May 20, 1921, by Senator Calder of New York. Referred to Committee on Commerce.

A Bill, S. 1882.—*To protect the public against fraud by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation in interstate commerce of misbranded, misrepresented, or falsely described articles, to regulate the traffic therein, etc.*

Introduced on May 20, 1921, by Senator Lodge of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A Bill, H. R. 7112.—*To prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to, cold-storage foods; to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate and foreign commerce; etc.*

Introduced on June 13, 1921, by Representative Haugen of Iowa. Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

A Bill, H. R. 7156.—*To prohibit the interstate sale of certain articles contaminated with anthrax.*

Introduced on June 15, 1921, by Representative Winslow of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, H. R. 4981.—*To amend "An Act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, etc."*

Introduced on April 26, 1921, by Representative Haugen of Iowa. Referred to Committee on Agriculture. Passed the House July 6, 1921. Referred to Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A Bill, H. R. 8086.—*To prohibit the shipment of filled milk in interstate or foreign commerce.*

Introduced on August 4, 1921, by Representative Voigt of Wisconsin. Referred to Committee on Agriculture. Passed House. Reported out favorably by Committee.

A Bill, H. R. 8378.—*Providing for the protection of the public health and the prevention of fraud and deception by prohibiting the manufacture, the sale, the offering for sale, or exposing for sale, or the having in possession with intent to sell, of adulterated or deleterious butter, and prescribing the penalty for the violation thereof.*

Introduced on August 23, 1921, by Representative Browne of Wisconsin. Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

## HEALTH, LOCAL APPLICATION

A Bill, H. R. 5902.—*Authorizing the erection of a sanitary, fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Santa Monica, California.*

Introduced on May 6, 1921, by Representative Osborne of California. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, H. R. 2230.—*Making an appropriation for erecting and equipping and otherwise providing a quarantine station at or near New Orleans, Louisiana.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative O'Connor of Louisiana. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, S. 333.—*For the construction of a complete hospital plant in the city of Memphis, Tennessee.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator McKellar of Tennessee. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, S. 132.—*Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the present marine hospital site in the city of Saint Louis, and to acquire a suitable and sufficient tract of land in or adjacent to the city of Saint Louis for the construction of a complete hospital plant for the treatment of beneficiaries of the war-risk insurance and the Public Health Service.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Spencer of Missouri. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, H. R. 2492.—*Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to continue and to enlarge the construction of the naval hospital at San Diego, California.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Representative Butler of Pennsylvania. Referred to Committee on Naval Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 2465.—*To authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be erected a suitable building or buildings for marine hospital purposes on the present marine hospital site at San Francisco, California, and to remove all or any of the present structures on said site.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Representative Kahn of California. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, S. 380.—*For the relief of the Shelby Medical College, of Nashville, Tennessee.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator McKellar of Tennessee. Referred to Committee on Claims.

A Bill, H. R. 2893.—*To provide for the care of certain insane citizens of the Territory of Alaska.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Representative Johnson of Washington. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

A Bill, S. 1198.—*To provide for the acquiring of a site and the erection of a United States hospital in the city of Saint Louis, Missouri.*

Introduced on April 25, 1921, by Senator Reed of Missouri. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, H. R. 5420.—*Making appropriation for a hospital building and equipment for the Paiute Indians at Yerington, Nevada.*

Introduced on April 28, 1921, by Representative Arentz of Nevada. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, H. R. 6570.—*Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to remove the quarantine station now situated at Fort Morgan, Alabama, to Sand Island, and to construct thereon a new quarantine station.*

Introduced on May 24, 1921, by Representative McDuffie, of Alabama. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, H. R. 6961.—*Granting certain lands to the State of Alabama for the use of the Searcy Hospital for the Colored Insane.*

Introduced on June 8, 1921, by Representative McDuffie of Alabama. Referred to Committee on Public Lands.

A Bill, S. 2052.—*Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Columbus Hospital, Great Falls, Montana, for the treatment of disabled Government employees.*

Introduced on June 13, 1921, by Senator Walsh of Montana. Referred to Committee on Claims.

A Bill, H. R. 7365.—*For the construction and equipment of a hospital plant in the city of Galveston, Texas, etc.*

Introduced on June 24, 1921, by Representative Briggs of Texas. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A Bill, S. 2169.—*Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Columbus Hospital, Great Falls, Montana, for the treatment of disabled Government employees.*

Introduced on June 27, 1921, by Senator Walsh of Montana. Referred to Committee on Claims.

A Bill, S. 2473.—*Granting certain lands to the city of Kayeville, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city.*

Introduced on September 22, 1921, by Senator King of Utah. Referred to Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A Bill, H. R. 9046.—*To limit the amount of water which may be withdrawn from Lake Michigan by the Sanitary District of Chicago, giving authority therefor, and fixing the conditions of such withdrawal.*

Introduced on November 9, 1921, by Representative Michaelson of Illinois. Referred to Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

A Bill, H. R. 9019.—*To provide for the erection, equipment, and maintenance of a hospital for the Paiute Indians at Yerington, Nevada.*

Introduced on November 4, 1921, by Representative Arentz of Nevada. Referred to Committee on Indian Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 9528.—*Providing for the retention by the Government of the property in Nome, Alaska, known as the detention hospital building, and for its use by the Bureau of Education, etc.*

Introduced on December 13, 1921 by Dan A. Sutherland, Delegate from Alaska. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.



## HEALTH, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A Bill, H. R. 115.—*To enable the Government to establish homes for the aged and infirm colored people and working girls, and an industrial farm, and to aid the people who must move from the alleys in the District of Columbia, and to provide work for the colored youth during the summer vacation, and to provide work for the returning colored soldiers.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Mason of Illinois. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, H. R. 2918.—*To regulate the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Representative Smith of Idaho. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Identical to S. 749.

A Bill, S. 758.—*To prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia or in any of the Territorial or insular possessions of the United States, and providing a penalty for violation thereof.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Myers of Montana. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary, and further referred to subcommittee of that Committee. Hearings held.

\*Featured in December number of The Capitol Eye.

A Bill, S. 810.—*To amend "An Act to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia."*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Cummings of Iowa. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, S. 624.—*To regulate the practice of the science of chiropractic in the District of Columbia.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Fletcher of Florida. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, S. 847.—*Creating the District of Columbia insurance fund for the benefit of employees injured and the dependents of employees killed in hazardous employments, providing for the administration of such fund by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and making an appropriation therefor.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Jones of Washington. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Identical to H. R. 4089.

A Bill, H. R. 2920.—*To establish a school and home for feeble-minded persons of the District of Columbia, to be known as the Columbia Training School, and providing for the legal commitment of feeble-minded persons, etc.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Representative Tinkham of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, H. R. 4118.—*For the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, etc.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Hearing held. No report. Identical to S. 1588.

A Bill, S. 1591.—*To amend "An Act to revive with amendments an Act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia."*

Introduced on May 4, 1921, by Senator France of Maryland. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary. Passed Senate and sent to House. Referred to House Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, S. 1575.—*To vacate and close certain streets and alleys within the area known as the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia.*

Introduced on May 4, 1921, by Senator Wadsworth of New York. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Identical to H. R. 5824.

A Bill, S. 2083.—*To regulate the practice of undertaking and embalming in the District of Columbia, and to safeguard the public health.*

Introduced on June 13, 1921, by Senator Ball of Delaware. Identical to H. R. 7659.

A Bill, S. 2246.—*Making it incumbent upon every person, firm or corporation injuring or damaging or causing damage to the person or the property of another which is lawfully upon a public street or highway of the District of Columbia to prove that the injury or damage was caused solely by the negligence of the one so injured or damaged, etc.*

Introduced on July 2, 1921, by Senator Fletcher of Florida. Referred to Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. Referred by Committee to Board of District Commissioners for report. Commissioners recommended unfavorable action on the bill.

A Bill, H. R. 7570.—*To regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia.*

Introduced on July 6, 1921, by Representative Focht of Pennsylvania. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, S. 2257.—*To regulate within the District of Columbia the sale of milk, cream, and certain milk products, etc.*

Introduced on July 12, 1921, by Senator Ball of Delaware. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Identical to H. R. 7746.

A Bill, S. 2283.—*To regulate the practice of medicine and midwifery in the District of Columbia, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof.*

Introduced on July 19, 1921, by Senator Ball of Delaware. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Hearing scheduled.

A Bill, H. R. 7911.—*Creating the District of Columbia insurance fund for the benefit of employees injured and the dependents of employees killed in hazardous employments, providing for the administration of such fund by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and making an appropriation therefor.*

Introduced on July 25, 1921, by Representative Fitzgerald of Ohio. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, H. R. 8084.—*To vacate certain streets and alleys within the area known as the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia.*

Introduced on August 4, 1921, by Representative Focht of Pennsylvania. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Identical to S. 2411.

(Continued on Page 15)

## CLASSIFIED LIST OF ALL EDUCATION BILLS PENDING IN CONGRESS

## EDUCATION, ALIENS

A Bill, S. 322.—*Regarding the education and naturalization of aliens and the children of aliens.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator McKellar of Tennessee. Referred to Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

A Bill, S. 846.—*To promote Americanization by providing for cooperation with the several States in the education of non-English speaking persons and the assimilation of foreign-born residents.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Kenyon of Iowa. Referred to Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

A Bill, H. R. 6959.—*To promote Americanization by providing for cooperation with the several States in the education of non-English speaking persons and the assimilation of foreign-born residents.*

Introduced on June 8, 1921, by Representative Vestal of Indiana. Referred to House Committee on Education.

A Bill, H. R. 5346.—*To reorganize and change the title of the Bureau of Naturalization of the Department of Labor and to create in its stead a bureau authorized to provide for the guidance, protection, and better economic distribution and adjustment of our alien population, such bureau to be known as the Bureau of Citizenship, etc.*

Introduced on April 27, 1921, by Representative Johnson of Washington. Referred to Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

A Bill, S. 88.—*To amend "An Act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Dillingham of Vermont. Referred to Committee on Immigration.

## EDUCATION, LOCAL APPLICATION

A Bill, S. 72.—*To establish an Indian boarding school at or near the city of Rolla in the State of North Dakota.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator McCumber of North Dakota. Referred to Committee on Indian Affairs.

A Bill, S. 236.—*Granting to the State of Nevada one million five hundred thousand acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Pittman of Nevada. Referred to Committee on Public Lands.

A Bill, S. 774.—*Granting to the State of Florida the United States Government lands in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Florida.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Trammell of Florida. Referred to Committee on Public Lands.

A Bill, S. 928.—*Granting certain lands to the State of Washington for the use of the State University, etc.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Senator Jones of Washington. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 6171.—*For the support and education of Indian pupils at the Greenville Indian School, California, etc.*

Introduced on May 12, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, H. R. 6434.—*For the support and education of the Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California, etc.*

Introduced on May 21, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

A Bill, H. R. 8440.—*Authorizing the acquisition for use of the War Department, for military purposes, of a right of way for a spur track railroad extending from the military reservation of the Presidio of San Francisco to the Fort Mason Military Reservation and the conveyance by the United States to the Regents of the University of California for art, educational, and park purposes, as full consideration for said right of way, of a certain portion of said military reservation of the Presidio of San Francisco, etc.*

Introduced on September 24, 1921, by Representative Kahn of California. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 8439.—*Authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain portions of the military reservation of the Presidio of San Francisco to the regents of the University of California for art, educational, and park purposes, and providing for the acquisition through eminent domain proceedings of a railroad right of way for the use of said reservation as a consideration for said grant, etc.*

Introduced on September 24, 1921, by Representative Kahn of California. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, CITIZENS

A Bill, H. R. 21.—*To amend an Act entitled "An Act to provide for the promotion of vocational education;" etc.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Fess of Ohio. Referred to Committee on Education.

A Bill, H. R. 2243.—*To authorize the more complete endowment of agricultural experiment stations, etc.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Purnell of Indiana. Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

A Bill, S. 450.—*To provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, to be used in researches and experiments in home economics, and regulating the expenditure thereof.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Smoot of Utah. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A Bill, H. R. 3154.—*To establish marketing departments in agricultural colleges in the several States of the United States.*

Introduced on April 14, 1921, by Representative Jacoway of Arkansas. Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

A Bill, H. R. 4108.—*To create a Bureau for the Deaf and Dumb in the Department of Labor, and prescribing the duties thereof.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on Education.

A Bill, S. 1061.—*To amend an Act entitled "An Act to provide for the promotion of vocational education," etc.* Introduced on April 21, 1921, by Senator Kenyon of Iowa. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor.

A Bill, S. 1944.—*Incorporating the Lighthouses for the Blind for the furtherance of the interests of the blind in the United States of America and throughout the world through their physical and mental betterment, through the development of methods and plans for their education and instruction, and through the opening of new trades and other occupations for their employment.*

Introduced on June 2, 1921, by Senator Warren of Wyoming. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

A Bill, S. 2639.—*To place control of Columbia Institution for the Deaf entirely under the president and board of directors of the institution and Congress.*

Introduced on October 20, 1921, by Senator Pomerene of Ohio. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor. Identical to H. R. 8911.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, MILITARY AND NAVAL

A Bill, H. R. 2159.—*To provide educational facilities for persons serving as members of the United States military or naval forces in the war with Germany and honorably discharged from such forces, etc.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Fess of Ohio. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

A Bill, S. 981.—*Providing for and establishing scholarships in each of the States as a memorial to the American soldiers, sailors, and marines who gave their lives for their country, and as an expression of appreciation to the brave and loyal men who served in the military and naval forces of the United States in the late war.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Senator Trammell of Florida. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor.

A Bill, S. 1037.—*To designate Tampa, Florida, as a post at which a marine school may be established under the act of Congress approved March 4, 1911.*

Introduced on April 21, 1921, by Senator Trammell of Florida. Referred to Committee on Naval Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 5901.—*To permit the Soldiers' Institute (Incorporated) to occupy the Government property at Bluemont, Loudoun County, Virginia, known as Mount Weather, in connection with its work for the care, education, and rehabilitation of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war, etc.*

Introduced on May 6, 1921, by Representative Moore of Virginia. Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

A Bill, H. R. 7154.—*To authorize the Secretary of War to transfer to the Federal Board for Vocational Education such property under the control of the War Department as is not required by that Department.*

Introduced on June 15, 1921, by Representative Ten Eyck of New York. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 7689.—*To provide for the industrial rehabilitation of the blind.*

Introduced on July 9, 1921, by Representative Ten Eyck of New York. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Identical to S. 2241.

#### EDUCATION, GENERAL PUBLIC

A Bill, H. R. 278.—*Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan to recognized scientific and engineering schools material, the property of the Navy Department, which is not in use.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Hicks of New York. Referred to Committee on Naval Affairs.

A Bill, H. R. 2350.—*To provide for the distribution of receipts by States for the construction and maintenance of public roads or for the support of public schools or other public educational institutions.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Taylor of Colorado. Referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A Bill, H. R. 167.—*To establish the International Exposition of the United States of America, to be located in or near the District of Columbia, in the interest of the commerce, mining, industry, agriculture, labor, education, arts, and science of the world.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Davis of Minnesota. Referred to Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

A Bill, H. R. 25.—*To create a national university at the seat of the Federal Government.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Fess of Ohio. Referred to the Committee on Education.

A Bill, H. R. 111.—*To amend the Act of February 4, 1887, regulating interstate commerce, to foster and encourage knowledge of American institutions.*

Introduced on April 11, 1921, by Representative Mason of Illinois. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, S. 523.—*To create the Department of Education.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Owen of Oklahoma. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor.

A Bill, S. 511.—*To establish a National Bulletin, an official record of legislative and administrative acts.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Owen of Oklahoma. Referred to the Committee on Printing.

A Bill, S. 524.—*To provide for public education upon political questions and for the dissemination of information upon political issues and matters of a political nature of public interest by an authorized publicity pamphlet.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator Owen of Oklahoma. Referred to Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A Bill, S. 622.—*To establish a National Conservatory of Music for the education of pupils in music in all its branches, vocal and instrumental, and for other purposes.*

Introduced on April 13, 1921, by Senator Fletcher of Florida. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor.



A Bill, S. 869.—*Further to assure title to lands granted the several States, in place, in aid of public schools.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Senator Smoot of Utah. Referred to Committee on Public Lands.

A Bill, H. R. 4129.—*To create the National Board of Rural Industrial Schools for Mountain Children.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Tillman of Arkansas. Referred to Committee on Education.

A Bill, H. R. 4116.—*To make accessible to all the people the valuable scientific and other research work conducted by the United States through establishment of a national school of correspondence.*

Introduced on April 18, 1921, by Representative Raker of California. Referred to Committee on Education.

A Bill, S. 1252.—*To create a Department of Education.*

Introduced on April 27, 1921, by Senator Sterling of South Dakota. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor. Identical to H. R. 7.

\*Featured in December number of The Capitol Eye.

A Bill, H. R. 5527.—*To authorize the compilation, printing, and sale of a Spanish-English and English-Spanish dictionary.*

Introduced on April 29, 1921, by Representative Campbell of Pennsylvania. Referred to Committee on the Library.

A Bill, S. 1721.—*To vest title to school lands in the State in which the lands are situated, etc.*

Introduced on May 9, 1921, by Senator Phipps of Colorado. Referred to Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Identical to H. R. 6158 and H. R. 6260.

A Bill, S. 61.—*To provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education.*

Introduced on April 12, 1921, by Senator McLean of Connecticut. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor. Identical to H. R. 7458 and H. R. 4385.

A Bill, H. R. 9292.—*To provide for the world-wide extension of education by the cooperation of national Governments.*

Introduced on December 5, 1921, by Representative Gillett of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on Education.

#### EDUCATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A Bill, S. 1436.—*To require the teaching of the Constitution of the United States in the schools of the District of Columbia.*

Introduced on May 2, 1921, by Senator Kenyon of Iowa. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

A Bill, S. 1976.—*To amend "An Act to regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia."*

Introduced on June 6, 1921, by Senator Capper of Kansas. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Reported by the Committee with amendments on July 11, 1921.

A Bill, S. 2040.—*To provide for compulsory school attendance of children, to provide for the taking of a school census, to create the department of school attendance and work permits for the administration of this Act and the Act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, etc.*

Introduced on June 10, 1921, by Senator Capper of Kansas. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Reported by the Committee with an amendment on June 28, 1921. Identical to H. R. 7038.

A Bill, H. R. 9543.—*To provide books and educational supplies free of charge to pupils of the public schools of the District of Columbia.*

Introduced on December 14, 1921, by Representative Focht of Pennsylvania. Referred to Committee of District of Columbia.

---

#### Continued from Page 12 (HEALTH, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

A Bill, S. 2601.—*To repeal the Act of Congress approved September 25, 1914, known as the Act to prohibit the use of alleys in the District of Columbia for residential purposes.*

Introduced on October 14, 1921, by Senator Myers of Montana. Referred to Committee on District of Columbia.

A Bill, S. 2597.—*To amend "An Act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia."*

Introduced on October 14, 1921, by Senator Ball of Delaware. Referred to Committee on District of Columbia. Identical to H. R. 8794.

A Bill, 8955.—*To regulate the sale of milk and cream in the District of Columbia, to safeguard the public health, etc.*

Introduced on November 1, 1921, by Representative Focht of Pennsylvania. Referred to Committee on District of Columbia.

A Bill, H. R. 9546.—*Relating to assuring compensation for accidental injuries or death of employees in certain occupations in the District of Columbia.*

Introduced on December 14, 1921, by Representative Underhill of Massachusetts. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### HEALTH, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

A Bill, H. R. 3203.—*To provide for the health and safety of employees of carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.*

Introduced on April 14, 1921, by Representative Bland of Indiana. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A Bill, S. 1109.—*To provide compensation for employees of the United States separated from the service on account of injuries received while in the performance of duty, etc.*

Introduced on April 25, 1921, by Senator Jones of Washington. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

A Bill, S. 1971.—*Admitting civilian employees of the United States Government stricken with tuberculosis to Army and Navy and Public Health Service Hospitals.*

Introduced on June 6, 1921, by Senator Sheppard of Texas. Referred to the Committee on Civil Service. Identical to H. R. 8907.

# NEW "PUBLIC WELFARE" LAWS

APPROVED NOVEMBER 23, 1921

*Explained by the Federal Executive Officers Charged with their Administration*

## THE "BEER" BILL

*By R. A. Haynes,*

*Federal Prohibition Commissioner*

The Willis-Campbell Bill, otherwise known as the Anti-Beer Act, marks a new step forward in enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment. Prohibition of beer for medicinal purposes will help enforcement greatly.

The Act also limits the activities of a small number of physicians and it strengthens the hands of the Department in dealing with the alleged medicinal preparations sold on the open market which have been used for beverage purposes. It prevents the further unnecessary manufacture and importation of liquor; and in clear and unmistakable language provides that the penalties imposed by the Internal Revenue laws shall be applicable wherever such laws are violated.

While the bill prohibits prescriptions of beer and malt liquors for medicinal purposes it does provide that vinous or spirituous liquor, in quantities of not more than one-fourth gallon, containing not more than one-half pint of alcohol may be prescribed in 10 days, physicians being by law limited to 100 prescriptions in 90 days, unless extraordinary reason is presented. The measure further provides that the Commissioner may cancel or require change of permits to manufacturers of patent medicines and preparations used as a beverage even if unfit for beverage use or require the formula for making extracts to be changed, or may cancel the permit if it appears that the sale or use of such article is substantially increased by reason of their use for beverage purposes.

No embarrassment in the enforcement is anticipated from the provisions imposing liability upon officers searching dwellings without warrant. Indeed, I have made it very plain that officers who violate Section 6 of the Willis-Campbell Act by searching dwellings occupied only as such, without warrants, will not be supported by the Prohibition Unit, nor protected from punishment.

In no fanciful way is it true that the enforcement of the law today is a contest between the official who is doing his duty and the criminal combination that attempts to defeat the purpose of the law for its gain, and the Government agent is in the thick of the fight. He not only is subjected to physical danger but to the greatest temptations on the one hand and to abuse and vilification on the other hand. He is held up to scorn and derision by the enemies of the law publicly, while he is cajoled and flattered, or offered bribes in private. These men are subject to the severest tests by the unconscionable enemies of the law in a continuous effort to break down their moral fibre and loyalty to duty. So the good citizenship of the country can perform a real service by giving encouragement and assistance to these men in the difficult task they attempt.

## THE "MATERNITY BILL"

*By Grace Abbott,*

*Chief of Children's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor.*

For the States to secure the benefits of the Shepard-Towner Act for the Promotion of the Welfare and Hygiene of Maternity and Infancy the State Legislature must or (the Governor may for a period limited to 6 months after the adjournment of the first regular session of the Legislature after the passage of the Act) accept the provisions of the Act, and designate a State agency with which the Children's Bureau is to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of the Act. In any State having a Child Welfare or Child Hygiene Division in its Health Department or Board, that division must be designated.

The Child Hygiene or Child Welfare Division of the Department of Health or other designated agency must submit detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of the Act within the State to the Children's Bureau for approval by the Federal Board of Maternity and Infant Hygiene. Section 8 of the Act provides that if the plans submitted by a State are in conformity with the provisions of this Act and reasonably appropriate and adequate to its purposes they shall be approved by the Board. It must make such reports to the Children's Bureau concerning its operations and expenditures for the purpose of the Act as shall be prescribed by the Bureau.

The benefits of the Act are—the funds available and the nature of work to be undertaken. The work will be largely educational—distributing information through actual demonstrations and instruction by Public Health Nurses, literature, etc. Benefits will vary in each State depending on how much has already been done. Prohibition as to use of funds may not be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, etc., buildings or lands nor for the payment of any maternity or infancy pension, stipend or gratuity.

The powers and duties of the Children's Bureau under the Act are—to cooperate with the agency designated by the several States; make such studies, investigations and reports as will promote the efficient administration of the Act; to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and to the Treasurers of the States the amount which has been apportioned to each State for the fiscal year; and the general administration of the Act.

The Federal Board of Maternity and Infant Hygiene consists of the Chief of the Children's Bureau, the Surgeon-General of the U. S. Public Health Service and the U. S. Commissioner of Education, the chairman to be elected by the Board. Its powers are—to approve or disapprove plans submitted by the States; and to withhold further certification of federal funds to a State if the money is not properly expended. A State may appeal from the decision of the Board to the President of the United States.

## A KEY TO CONGRESS

By HON. WM. TYLER PAGE

*Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress*

Every month Mr. Page, who has been an important part of the legislative machinery of the United States Congress for forty years, will explain some phase of the legislative procedure of that body. This key to congressional methods will enable the public to better understand the making of national laws. This department is an outgrowth of "The Legislative Glossary" featured in previous issues of *The Capitol Eye*.

A legislative proposition of the superior class is designated "A Bill," as distinguished from resolutions. When a bill is finally enacted it is then called "An Act." This also is true officially of a bill that has passed but one of the two Houses of Congress; but the term "bill" usually follows a measure throughout its legislative processes to final approval by the President, when it becomes "An Act" and is so designated in the compiled statutes.

Frequently the term "bill" is used in a generic sense as embracing any kind of proposition. The term itself is derived from English parliamentary terminology, and is very old, its genesis probably traceable to ancient systems of jurisprudence.

There are classes of bills, such as Senate and House Bills; Public and Private Bills; Appropriation Bills; Revenue Bills, which embrace also the subject of the tariff; and Omnibus Bills.

Senate bills are bills presented or introduced in the Senate, designated by number, thus: S. 1, etc. House bills are bills presented or introduced in the House of Representatives, designated by number, thus: H. R. 1, etc.

**Public Bills.**—A public bill relates to public matters and deals with individuals only by classes. Bills relating to the revenue, to the tariff, to appropriations, to public lands, to the courts, etc., are classed as public bills. And, under the House practice, these are divided into two classes: (a) directly or indirectly appropriating money or property. (b) not raising revenue nor directly or indirectly appropriating money or property. The character of public bills determines the method of their consideration.

**Private Bills.**—A private bill is a bill for the relief of one or several specified persons, corporations, institutions, etc. The line of distinction between public and private bills is difficult to define in many cases. It has been the practice in Congress to consider as private such as are "for the interest of individuals, public companies or corporations, a parish, city, county, or other locality."

**Appropriation Bills.**—Known as general appropriation bills, twelve in number, appropriate revenue for the support of the Government. These bills have certain privileged status to insure their prompt consideration.

**Revenue Bills.**—Or bills raising revenue such as the various Liberty and Victory Loan Acts, the war revenue acts, the recently enacted revenue bill and tariff bills. These, too, are privileged bills in the House.

**Omnibus Bills.**—Are bills grouping certain cognate objects—such as items granting pensions to a number of individuals by name, or granting relief to a number of claimants by name, or authorizing the construction of public buildings in various cities and towns, etc.

**Joint Resolution.**—A development of modern practice is the joint resolution, which does not differ in any respect from a bill so far as the processes of Congress in its consideration are concerned. It must pass through the same travail to which a bill is subjected, except in the case of a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution, which does not require the approval of the President.

Joint resolutions are used for what may be called the incidental, unusual, or inferior purposes of legislating, but this is not always true. Their original purpose was to be temporary and to pass out of existence when that purpose was served, and not, as in the case of bills, to go into the permanent statutes. Yet, frequently, a joint resolution embodies permanent law. In short, the only real difference between a bill and a joint resolution is in the name.

Simple resolutions serve the purpose of one or the other Houses in matters of interest to that House in which they are employed.

Concurrent resolutions are used as a means of expressing fact, principles, opinions and purposes of the two Houses. They may not contain a proposition of legislation, and are operative when agreed to by both Houses without the approval of the President.



## QUERY COLUMN

Answers by HON. WM. TYLER PAGE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

In which Mr. Page answers all inquiries from the field pertaining to parliamentary and political procedure.

Address all communications to The Capitol Eye, Munsey Bldg., Washington, D. C.

1. "What is meant by the term 'Gerrymandering'?"—A Student.

*Answer.*—An arbitrary arrangement of the legislative or Congressional districts of a State regardless of geographical contiguity and compactness, whereby a minority of the voters of one party may be so grouped as to elect all or a majority of the Representatives in Congress or a State Legislature. The word was coined in 1811 from the name of Elbridge Gerry, who as governor of Massachusetts signed a bill passed by the Democratic majority of the legislature grouping the sections which gave Federalist majorities into one district, with a fancied resemblance to a salamander. Hence—"Gerrymander."

2. "Is it always necessary to have a second to a motion?"—An editor.

*Answer.*—No; not in the House of Representatives. In the early Congresses the rules required motions to be seconded, but before the rule was changed the second was dropped in practice as to ordinary motions. The present rule is: "When a motion has been made, the Speaker shall state it \* \* \* and it shall then be in possession of the House" \* \* \*. Of course, this presupposes that the motion or proposition is one that can be submitted properly under the rules. The rules also provide for the making of motions and their preferential order.

In the House of Representatives the "second" now is used under two conditions only, i. e., on a motion to suspend the rules and on a motion to adjourn when the House is operating under a call in the absence of a quorum. In both instances a majority is required to second the motion. The individual "second" was abandoned in the rules in 1880 and long before in practice.

3. "Why is a Congressman at-Large?"—A new voter.

*Answer.*—A member of the United States House of Representatives elected by the voters of an entire State, and not, as is customary, by those of a Congressional District. The apportionment act of 1912 provided that Congressman (that is, Representatives) shall be elected from districts composed of contiguous territory and containing as nearly as possible an equal number of inhabitants, the number of such districts equaling the number of Representatives to which the State is entitled; but "in case of an increase in the number of Representatives which may be given to any State under this apportionment such additional Representative or Representatives shall be elected by the State at large and the other Representatives by the districts now prescribed by law until the legislature of such State, in the manner herein prescribed, shall redistrict such State."

During the last decade the legislatures of two States, Illinois, entitled to 27 Representatives, and Pennsylvania, entitled to 36 Representatives, failed to redistrict. Consequently Illinois has 25 Districts and 2 Congressmen at-Large, and Pennsylvania has 32 Districts and 4 Congressmen at-Large. Failure to redistrict a State whose representation is increased is an advantage to the dominant party in that State.

## NEWS SECTION

### STATUS OF BILLS PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED IN THE CAPITOL EYE

December 19, 1921.—The Sheppard-Towner "Maternity Bill" (S. 1039) became a public law (No. 97) on November 23, 1921, when it was signed by the President. As rapidly as the States accept its provisions, Congress will make the appropriations authorized by the Act. An explanation of its administration will be found on Page 16 of this number.

December 19, 1921.—The Campbell-Willis "Beer Bill" (H. R. 7294) became a public law (No. 96) on November 23, 1921, when it was signed by the President. An explanation of its administration will be found on Page 16 of this number.

December 19, 1921.—No action has been taken in this Congress by Committees handling the Fess-Kenyon "Public Welfare Department Bill," the Towner-Sterling "Department of Education Bill," or the Fess-Capper "Physical Education Bill," due to the appointment early in the first session of a Joint Congressional Committee on the Reorganization of the Government Departments. A report from this Committee is expected within the next few weeks. It will include provisions directly affecting all of these bills, which will necessitate a re-opening of the issues at stake. The report as it affects these issues will be covered by The Capitol Eye.

December 19, 1921.—The Myers "Dog-Exemption Bill" (S. 758) still rests in Committee.

## THE "COME-BACK"

A DEPARTMENT DEVOTED TO PUBLIC OPINION AND INQUIRY

Address all communications to The Capitol Eye, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

"Does your publication reach all Congressmen?"

"Do you intend continuing discussion of the Sheppard-Towner (Maternity) Bill?"—Secretary of a Civic Organization.

*Answer.*—Our publication reaches a large number of Congressmen, who are subscribers.

Since the Sheppard-Towner Maternity Bill is now a public law (approved November 23, 1921), it no longer falls under the surveillance of The Capitol Eye. Future Congressional action affecting it as a law will be reported in the "News Section."

"I should like to know if any other States in the Union have ever introduced measures similar to the Myers Dog-Exemption Bill?"—A School Teacher.

*Answer.*—Measures similar to the Myers Dog-Exemption Bill have been introduced in a large percentage of State legislatures. Maine is the only State which has passed an anti-vivisection measure.

"Is it your intention through the columns of your publication to give information as to the progress of bills, notices and reports of hearings, etc.?"—General-Director of a National Organization, N. Y. City.

*Answer.*—Only of the bills featured by the magazine. Full information on all other bills is furnished by "The Capitol Eye Direct Service." (See page 2.)

"I note with deep gratification the December issue of The Capitol Eye and its discussion of Bills directly concerning the lives of all of us. Justice and enlightenment must travel somewhere near together, and I see clear signs of it in the Myers Bill "to exempt dogs from vivisection."—A Writer, N. Y. City.

The unquestionable tendency of the Capper-Fess Physical Education Bill and similar legislation is toward the designation and control of the individual's form of medical treatment either directly or indirectly through State officers by a paternalistic central Government. This is the intent of the bill, whether expressed in the bill's text or not, and this would be the result if passed. Real Americans do not wish, and will resist, any effort to train and form their bodies or their minds according to any cut and dried standards. Individual freedom and initiative must and will be preserved.—Interested Citizen, Washington, D. C.

"It seems to me that this magazine should prove of unusual interest to business and professional men who desire to keep abreast of the times and are thoroughly public-spirited."—Rotarian, Chicago, Ill.

"I am perfectly delighted with The Capitol Eye. I certainly think that you have hit the nail on the head—if one hits nails with Eyes. You ought to have a tremendous circulation and if you carry out the all-sided policy of this initial issue, you surely will. These are days when women who are interested in their country must have authentic sources of information, and I believe The Capitol Eye will be one of these."—Editor, Rural Woman's Publication.

"The Capitol Eye should be interesting, instructive and timely for all who prize medical liberty, tolerance and health in America."—An M. D., Ph. D., Bridgeport, Conn.

"The Fess-Capper bill for giving financial help to States that pass proper physical education laws looks practical to us—has an over-the-top air. Also, the Federal Aid clauses of the Towner-Sterling bill. In no other way can education gain its proper momentum. We stand for Americans hundred per cent fit and one hundred per cent educated. These bills are the high-road to this end—the road of Health and Education for Everybody."—Legislative Chairman of a Woman's National Organization.

"It is a wholly Prussian idea that the State has more knowledge than all its citizens, and can only lead to disaster. When the 150,000 physicians, 220,000 nurses and 2,400,000 annual mothers depend for instruction and advice on a single political bureau at Washington, America will be another failure like Rome and Russia."—Editor, Woman's Publication.

"Never yet, I believe, has an enterprise been conducted as economically by the government as when in private hands; therefore when the government goes into welfare work, we shall be in for a system that will be both costly and tyrannical."—Secretary of a Citizens' Organization, Chicago.

"The proposed Public Welfare Department is not needed by a clean people in a clean community. People and communities found to be not clean can be attended to without the extravagance, false notions, red tape, class privilege and grave danger which would attend such a new Department of the Government."—Citizen, N. Y. City.